

## REMARKS

OBJECTION

Claim 7 was objected to as having insufficient antecedent for the words "said bag" and "said cap". Claim 7 has been amended to read 'wide mouth opening' and 'sampling container' as recited in claim 1.

Claims 10, 11, 18, 26 and 30 were objected to for using trademarked names. 'Teflon' has been replaced with polytetrafluoroethylene and 'tedlar' has been replaced with polyvinylfluoride film' or the claims have been canceled.

"Downflow/ down flow", "upflow/ up flow", and "sidewalls/ side walls" have been spelled consistently as 'upflow', 'downflow' and 'sidewalls' or removed from the claims.

Claims

112 REJECTION

Claims 1-13 and 15-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, and 10 have been amended to recite the connectors as 'quick connect fittings'. Support for this amendment is in the Specification on page 5, line 12.

102 REJECTION

Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ray, et al, 5,607,234.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly state the quick connect fittings, eyelet openings, and rack insertable in the pressure vessel neither claimed nor disclosed by Ray. Therefor claim 1 and depending claims 5, 7, 9, and 10-12 are not anticipated by Ray. Applicants request that the anticipation rejection for these claims be withdrawn.

Claim 14 has been amended to more clearly state that the pressure vessel of the present invention is pressurized with a pressure fluid introduced into the chamber formed between the pressure vessel and the sampling container. Ray recites a gas line used to power a piston to apply pressure. Claim 14 has also been amended to more clearly state the the connections are quick connect fittings not claimed or disclosed by Ray. Therefor claim 14 and depending claims 19-26 and 30 are not anticipated by Ray. Applicants request that the anticipation rejection be withdrawn.


103 REJECTION

Claims 2, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as been unpatentable over Ray. These claims have been canceled.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ray in view of Sinko, 4,453,927. Claim 17 has been canceled.

In the Office Action dated June 7, 2005, the Examiner indicated claims 3-5, 7, 10-13, and 18-30 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 112 rejections and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 2, 3, and 4 have been canceled and incorporated into independent claim 1. Claims 15-18 have been canceled and incorporated into independent claim 14. Applicants believe that in view of the amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Joy Alwan", written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants  
Joy Alwan Reg. No. 40,486  
Telephone (630) 252-2179

Date: 2 Sept 05